DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 394 566 JC 960 301

AUTHOR Ackerman, Ann
TITLE Faculty Performance Review and Evaluation: Principles, Guidelines, and Successes.
PUB DATE Feb 96
NOTE 7p.; In: The Olympics of Leadership: Overcoming Obstacles, Balancing Skills, Taking Risks. Proceedings of the Annual International Conference of the National Community College Chair Academy (5th, Phoenix, AZ, February 14-17, 1996); see JC 960 276.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; *Faculty College Relationship; *Faculty Evaluation; *Job Performance; Management by Objectives; Personnel Management; Program Design; Teacher Evaluation; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

A comprehensive faculty performance appraisal program is necessary for any college to maintain a high standard of excellence, effectiveness, and accountability. Faculty performance should be reviewed using established, fair, and consistent procedures that consider obligations, agreed-upon objectives, and performance standards. The purposes of the review are to assess individual job performance; encourage the highest quality of job performance; reward performance which meets or exceeds the established performance criteria; identify individual knowledge, skills, and needs for development; clarify future performance expectations, goals, and priorities of the faculty and the division chair or dean; and maintain effective communication between faculty and the chair or dean for improving methods and procedures used in performing the work. Evaluation is dependent upon shared responsibility and rigorous professional judgments. Moreover, only items that have been agreed to should be evaluated, focusing on quality rather than quantity. Faculty performance review is an on-going process that relies heavily on the mutual involvement of the faculty person and the dean. Prior to the evaluation period, the faculty member and dean should have discussed goals, expectations, activities, and areas of emphasis for the upcoming year. Performance issues should also be discussed throughout the year, with the annual performance review scheduled at the end of the evaluation period. (TGI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 394 566

FACULTY PERFORMANCE REVIEW AND EVALUATION:

PRINCIPLES, GUIDELINES, AND SUCCESSES

By

Ann Ackerman
Dean, Science/Math
Oklahoma Community College
Oklahoma City, OK

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Paper Presented at the
Fifth Annual International Conference for
Community & Technical College Chairs, Deans and Other Organizational Leaders
February 14 - 17, 1996
Phoenix/Mesa, Arizona

TC 960 301

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

ACADEMY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
G. Filan
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

ANN ACKERMAN

EDUCATION:

- B.S., Mathematics, Oklahoma State University, 1972
- M.Ed., Mathematics Education, University of Oklahoma, 1974
- Ph.D., Mathematics Education, University of Oklahoma, 1980
- Postdoctoral Work, Computer Science, Central State Univ., Edmond, 1982-83

EXPERIENCE:

- Oklahoma City Community College, 1977 to Present. Dean of Science and Mathematics, 1993 - Present; Division Director of Science and Mathematics, 1989-1993; Professor of Mathematics 1977-1989
- Yukon Public Schools, Yukon, Oklahoma, Mathematics Teacher, 1972-77
- Southwestern Bell Telephone, Oklahoma City, Engineer, 1972

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND ACTIVITIES:

- Oklahoma State Alliance for Minority Participation in Science, Mathematics and Engineering, Executive Committee, 1990 - Present, President-Elect, 1993 - Present
- National Science Foundation Alliance for Minority Participation Grant, CO-PI, 1994, $5 million
- Coalition for the Advancement of Mathematics Education in Oklahoma, Board of Directors, 1991 - Present
- Oklahoma City Public School Foundation, Board of Trustees, 1987 - Present
- Applications in Mathematics for High School Students (A project funded by in 1989 an EESA grant), Director, 1989, Administrative Coordinator/Fund Raiser, 1990 - Present
- Summer Academies for Mathematics, Science and Multidisciplinary Studies (A Project funded by Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education), Administrative Coordinator, 1990 - 1995, Grants Review Committee, 1990 - 1995
- Oklahoma Association of Community and Junior Colleges, President, 1986-87
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, Speaker at 1 regional and 4 national conventions
- Inservice Workshop Leader: Oklahoma City Public Schools; Konowa Public Schools; Wewoka Public Schools; Putnam City Public Schools; Bartlesville Public Schools; Oklahoma State Department of Education
- American Mathematical Association of Two-Year Colleges, Speaker at national convention
- North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, Evaluation Team Member for Edwards Elementary School, 1989, and Wilson Elementary School, 1990

HONORS AND AWARDS:

- Region 3 Outstanding Community and Technical College Chair, National Community College Chair Academy, 1995.
- Distinguished Leadership Award, National Association for Community Leadership, 1992 and 1993
- Oklahoma City Community College Employee Award for Excellence, 1993
- Leaders, A Professional Development Project for Women Administrators in Higher Education, National Institute for Leadership Development, 1992
- Outstanding Citizen Award, South OKC Chamber of Commerce, Public Education Committee, 1989

PUBLICATIONS:

- "AIM-HI Oklahoma" The Mathematics Teacher, Vol. 84, No. 5 (May 1991), 409-410
- "Using a Calculator" The Mathematics Teacher, Vol. 83, No. 2 (Feb. 1990), 83-84
- "Problem Solving With a Calculator" The Oklahoma Mathematics Teacher, (Spring 1989)
- "A Mathematics Department Newsletter" The AMATYC Review, 10 (Spring 1989), 33-34
- "The Effect of the Use of the Calculator on Mathematics Anxiety in College Algebra Students", The AMATYC Review 4 (Spring/Summer 1983), 20-25
- Executive producer of the following video presentations: "Problem Solving: The Pizza Paradox," aired Oct. 13, 1989, on OETA, Okla.'s public TV network; "Planning a College Education," aired November 3, 1989, on OETA.

Faculty Performance Review and Evaluation: Principles, Guidelines, and Successes

I. Introduction

A comprehensive performance appraisal program is necessary for any college to maintain a high standard of excellence, effectiveness and accountability. For this program to work, some significant balances must be maintained:

1. It must be a program in which the Board of Regents, the President, and the College faculty and staff have confidence.

2. The program must be administered and maintained primarily by the President and the Director of Human Resources in a way which reflects the will of the Board and meets the defensible needs of the college.

3. The program should serve as a source of encouragement for employees to pursue excellence with the knowledge that there is in place a systematic approach to performance appraisal.

4. Flexibility to accommodate the changing needs of the college must be a feature of the program.

II. Purpose

A college reviews the performance of its faculty using established, fair and consistent procedures considering obligations, agreed-upon objectives and performance standards. Performance reviews and evaluations are conducted on a regularly scheduled basis to support the college's philosophy of accountability, thereby recognizing quality of performance and encouraging its improvement. The purposes of these evaluations are to:

1. Assess individual job performance.

2. Encourage the highest quality of job performance.

3. Reward performance which meets or exceeds the established performance criteria.

4. Identify individual knowledge, skill and attitude development needs to support job performance.

5. Clarify future performance expectations, goals and priorities of the faculty and chair or dean.

6. Maintain effective communication between faculty and chair or dean in improving methods and procedures used in performing the work.

III. Principles

Certain principles or guidelines should apply in all areas covered in the faculty evaluation process. Some of these are as follows:

EVALUATION IS DEPENDENT UPON SHARED RESPONSIBILITY AND RIGOROUS PROFESSIONAL JUDGMENTS.

Fundamental to successful evaluation is the recognition and acceptance of shared responsibility. Prior to the formal evaluation conference, the faculty person completes a self-evaluation and the dean completes an evaluation of the faculty person, each using a common instrument. At the conference, full consideration is given by each party to both evaluations. At the conclusion of the conference, the dean draws conclusions and renders a summative statement and rating of the faculty person's performance for that period.

ONLY AGREED TO ITEMS ARE EVALUATED.

Inherent within the evaluation philosophy is that a faculty person is evaluated upon what he/she has agreed. These agreements are made in several ways.

1. When a faculty person accepts employment with the college, he or she agrees to:

   a. Support and promote the functions, philosophy and goals of the college as outlined in the college master plan.

   b. Abide by the procedures as outlined in the procedures manual.

   c. Fulfill the role and duties outlined in the job description for a faculty person.

2. At the beginning of each year, a contract is signed which includes the projected teaching load and any general or special objectives.

3. During the course of a year the faculty person and dean may reach other specific agreements, the content of which may be properly included in the evaluation.

EVALUATION DEALS WITH QUALITY RATHER THAN QUANTITY.

The evaluation process deals primarily with the quality of a person's performance. The workload process deals primarily with the quantity. Quantity enters the evaluation process only in regards to the amount produced as compared with the amount one agreed to produce.

IV. Process

Faculty performance review is an on-going process that relies heavily on the mutual involvement of the faculty person and the dean.

Prior to the evaluation period, the faculty person and dean will have discussed goals, expectations, activities, and areas of emphasis for the upcoming year. The level of emphasis for each performance categories will be determined by mutual agreement. Examples of performance categories might be Instructional Effectiveness, Professional Development, Instructional Programs, and College and Professional Activities. The performance indicators and sources of input that will apply to each performance category will also be determined.

Throughout the evaluation period, the faculty person and dean will discuss matters related to performance as the need arises. Either the faculty person or dean may request a mid-year performance review conference. Mutually agreed upon changes in goals and expectations may be made as a result of a mid-year conference. The faculty person and dean will discuss any input obtained to that date that relates to performance. Any strengths or concerns that have been identified by either person will be discussed and recorded at this conference.

The annual performance review and evaluation conference will take place at the end of the evaluation period. Each performance indicator will be reviewed using standard and agreed upon sources of input, the faculty person's self-evaluation, and the dean's observations. Each performance category will be evaluated and assigned a performance rating in accordance with the College performance appraisal program. An overall rating will be determined in accordance with the College performance appraisal program.

Performance appraisals may be appealed by a faculty person by requesting a follow-up conference with the dean. If not resolved, the faculty person should submit a written statement of the case to the Director of Human Resources. A performance review hearing committee will be formed. The review committee's function is to ensure that the faculty member was treated and evaluated fairly and not to change the performance rating. The review committee will report its findings to the Vice President who will make the final decision in the matter.